

in uranium mining, related nuclear technologies, or nuclear capable ballistic missile technology.

It prohibited Iran from launching ballistic missiles, including on its own territory. It required Iran to refrain from any development of ballistic missiles that are nuclear capable.

It mandated that countries not export major combat systems to Iran, but does not bar sales of missiles that are not on the U.N. Register of Conventional Arms. It called on the vigilance of international lending to Iran, providing trade credits and other financing.

It called on countries to inspect cargoes carried by Iran air cargo and Islamic Republic of Iran shipping lines or by any ship in national or international waters, if there are indications that they are carrying cargo banned for carriage to Iran.

Searches in international waters would require concurrence of the country where the ship is registered, but it could happen. It froze the assets of Iranian persons and entities named in annexes to the resolutions and required that countries ban the travel of named Iranians.

That was back in the day, Mr. Speaker; yet here we are today, 2 days after the administration went around Congress to bind the United States to a U.N. Security Council resolution that will lift all of those resolutions. You see all of those resolutions; we just ripped them up, no longer needed. We did not achieve a single thing that those previous six resolutions called for.

Now, to make matters worse, Mr. Speaker, the P5+1 countries will honor their obligations on this new U.N. Security Council resolution, while the Iranian regime laughs at us all the way to the bomb.

Iran has never felt compelled to honor its international obligations; and now, we are just supposed to expect it to fully comply with this? A zebra can't change its stripes, and this Iranian regime will never feel obligated to abide by this new international agreement.

Why tie our hands like this, Mr. Speaker? This is a bad and dangerous nuclear deal. I would urge my colleagues to reject it.

There has been a lot of talk, Mr. Speaker, about these anytime, anywhere inspections. I think it is important for us to examine what this agreement actually says about anytime, anywhere.

If the IAEA has concerns regarding undeclared nuclear materials or activities, they can request clarification from Iran. They request clarification from Iran. Oh, please explain to us. If Iran's clarification does not satisfy the IAEA, then the IAEA can request access to such locations—request.

If the two sides are unable to reach satisfactory arrangements within 14 days of the IAEA's original request—look at the timeline, Mr. Speaker—

then the joint commission would advise on how to resolve that issue within an additional 7 days; then Iran will have another 3 days to implement such a decision.

Can you keep up with me, ladies and gentlemen? Do the math. Iran actually has 24 days to stall or hide any undeclared nuclear material.

Is that the definition now of anytime, anywhere inspections, Mr. Speaker? I don't think so, and Iran's Defense Minister doesn't think so either. Why do I say that? Just 2 days ago, he said that the IAEA would not be allowed to inspect any of Iran's military sites.

They have been saying over and over again—the Supreme Leader has said the same thing multiple times—Iran will not let foreigners inspect any military center or interview its nuclear scientists.

On top of that, Iran's Foreign Minister and chief negotiator said, just yesterday, that Iran has secured the so-called right to deny the IAEA access to its nuclear sites for inspections.

Iran has also banned American nuclear inspectors from entering any nuclear site or participating on any International Atomic Energy Agency inspection team. No American can participate.

Let's just say, for argument's sake, that Iran is caught cheating, as unlikely as that might be—and I am being facetious obviously—what happens then? Well, it says it right here. It is very clear. The deal states that, if the countries believe that Iran is not meeting its commitment under this agreement, they can refer the issue to the joint commission.

The commission would have 15 days or longer to resolve the issue; then the issue can be referred to the ministers of foreign affairs if the commission could not resolve the issue. That is another 15 days for the ministers, Mr. Speaker.

Let's do the math. We are already up to 30 days at the minimum. Then the compliance participant could request that the issue be considered to the advisory board, which will have another 15 days to issue a nonbinding opinion.

If it is not resolved during this process and the U.N. Security Council gets notified, by the end, another 2 months or so would have passed and given Iran enough time to lobby Russia, China, and the rest of the P5+1 to vote with them so that sanctions are not reimposed.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, sanctions will only be reimposed in the event of a significant nonperformance by Iran. The key word there is "significant."

What does the U.S. consider significant violations? What do the Europeans consider significant violations? What does China consider it? What does Russia and Iran, itself, consider significant violations?

Iran can prevent from sanctions being reimposed, as long as they cheat only in small increments and not significantly. If they just cheat a little bit, they can get away with it.

Additionally, the JCPOA explicitly states: "Iran has stated that if sanctions are reinstated in whole or in part, Iran will treat that as grounds to cease performing its commitment under this JCPOA in whole or in part."

Iran is saying: If you put sanctions on us, we don't have to continue with this agreement.

I am not making it up. That is a quote. Even if Iran is caught cheating and we move to reimpose sanctions, as we are entitled to do under the JCPOA, Iran is actually entitled to walk away from the deal.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I feel that Iran will use this as its trump card to bully the P5+1 into not addressing violations or holding Iran accountable for its cheating. Even though the United States has the ability to veto a Security Council vote, choosing not to reimpose sanctions and hold Iran accountable, we must, again, remember that such a veto would unravel this deal, reapply sanctions, and allow Iran to claim it can walk away.

Finally, an effective sanctions regime against Iran that was established over many years cannot be easily re-applied. The idea of snapback sanctions is simply not viable.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on about all of the loopholes in this deal. Suffice it to say, we can do better than this. We must do better than this. We owe it to our children and our grandchildren to do better than this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2130

THE IRAN DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I both applaud and appreciate the comments by my colleague, a person I love being a colleague with, Ms. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN. These are profound points, excellent points, she has been making about the so-called Iran deal.

What is shocking to me—and I got this copy that a friend was using, but the pages aren't numbered. By the way, Mr. Speaker, when Secretary Kerry came to the Hill today—in having been through briefings by our Secretary previously—I knew that the best use of my time would be in going and reading the deal for myself, which is what I did.

It was interesting. I know that we have been assured over and over publicly that this is such a great deal, that this is what is going to really save the world from the Iranians having a nuclear deal, but there are some very troubling things that I haven't heard anybody mention about this agreement.

Actually, there is a report that there is an outside deal that has to be arranged by the IAEA with Iran in order

to have a complete deal, which is that the IAEA is going to have to work out terms—conditions—of its examination of some of the nuclear facilities in Iran. That is deeply troubling.

Here is a story by Joel Gehrke from July 21, entitled “House Republican: Obama Administration Won’t Release Full Iran Deal to Congress.”

It reads:

“Senator TOM COTTON and Representative MIKE POMPEO, who serves on the House Intelligence Committee, learned of the arrangement while meeting with the IAEA in Vienna, Austria, last week. ‘That we are only now discovering that parts of this dangerous agreement are being kept secret begs the question of what other elements may also be secret and entirely free from public scrutiny.’”

Meeting with the IAEA is something that I have done in the last year and a half, but because of the ban by our Speaker on my being able to travel because I was hoping to have a different Speaker, I am not able to visit anymore in a room with the IAEA in their office in Vienna. That was immensely helpful to do in the job.

As one of the Speaker’s folks mentioned, they see taxpayer-funded travel as a reward, and I haven’t earned their giving away taxpayer-funded travel. Apparently, that is something you earn by voting like you are told to. In any event, I am glad that MIKE POMPEO and Senator TOM COTTON have been over there and have met with them.

There is just so much about this deal that stinks to high heaven, especially when you see it today, in that, apparently, in the last year or so, there must have been approval for an exception to the sanctions on Iran to allow Iran to have 13 metric tons of pure gold shipped to it from South Africa.

Then we find out today that, actually, the U.S. was releasing \$4.2 billion to Iran, apparently in return, paying them to sit down and negotiate further.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that our allies have got to be really miffed as they find out more and more about the way this administration operates.

If you are our friend, we are going to cut deals with your enemy that create a real issue as to whether or not you may exist in the future. But if you are our enemy, we will pay you just to sit down and negotiate with us.

We will allow you to get gold shipped to you from 13 metric tons. There is no telling how much grief those 13 metric tons of gold have cost the U.S. I wonder how many American lives have had their demise contributed to because of the gold.

How many Jews or Christians around the world have lost their lives as a result of this administration’s paying the world’s leading sponsor of terror all of this money, apparently, just to sit down with them and releasing all of this money in the past just to get them to come to the table? We don’t do that with our friends. We don’t pay them to sit down with us.

We have already seen this in the attempted dealings with the Taliban. Mr. Speaker, it has not been that many years ago. It has been since I have been in Congress that this administration was reaching out to the Taliban, which has killed so many Americans and continues to kill Americans.

In fact, under Commander in Chief George W. Bush, we lost—I believe it was—about 560 precious military American lives in Afghanistan in that entire 7½ years—about 7¼ years, actually.

This President has only been in office 6½ years, and under his command—his rules of engagement that cripple our military’s ability to defend themselves—under this administration and this Commander in Chief’s rules, there have been over three times that many lost American, precious, military lives.

With this President being in command of three times the number of lost American military lives in Afghanistan, this administration’s approach couldn’t learn anything from the Bush administration’s mistakes and successes.

Instead, it decided to reach out. There are all kinds of reports of their reaching out their offers. “Look, Taliban. If you will just sit down—no preconditions. If you will just agree to sit down with us, we will be releasing murderers you want released from Guantanamo or anywhere else. Not only that, we will buy you luxurious offices in Qatar—or wherever you say—just to sit down with us.”

Our enemies have really learned how to deal with this administration. Our friends have got to be scratching their heads, those who still have their heads. Therein lies another tragedy.

In this agreement, until I can be sure that the parts I read have been released publicly—and that is why I was asking for this copy of the agreement. It is a different format from what I was reading earlier today.

As a judge, as a chief justice, even as a lawyer who has taken on the world’s largest oil company—I did years ago successfully—and as a lawyer who has taken on some pretty unbelievable efforts, words mean a lot when I am reading through things.

There is one word that particularly catches my attention, and that is the little two-letter disjunctive word “or.” Until I can be sure that what I had read has been released—it should be. There is no reason that this agreement should not be public so everyone can read it.

To those folks out there who are saying, “Hey, it is a 10-year deal. It will keep Iran from having nuclear weapons for 10 years. Even though it may come back and have a nuclear weapon within a month, 2 months, 3 months after the 10 years, at least it will keep them tied up for 10 years.” I would encourage anybody who has access to the actual agreement to look at any years mentioned—8, 10, whatever it is—and then see if there is that little two-letter disjunctive word “or” and then see if

there is a provision for a shorter time than 10 years or a shorter time than 8 years to develop intercontinental ballistic missiles.

These are things I have seen publicly, but I think it is critical. What kind of time or length of time of this deal are we looking at?

If there is this disjunctive little word “or” anywhere after any time that this deal will last, we need to know how long that other provision might be that would be shorter than 10 years.

If that provision, if such exists, puts the hands of how long this deal will last completely out of the United States’ hands, completely out of the P5+1, then that alone makes this deal a “no” deal. It is outrageous that anything but a hard timeline could exist in such a deal.

There is a story from July 16 by James Jay Carafano. The first paragraph reads:

“Once a major diplomatic agreement is inked, the world typically reacts by holding its breath, waiting to see if it will all turn out all right. Some deals, like the Munich Pact, crumble quickly. Others, like the Camp David Accords, hang in there; but rarely has there been a deal like the one reached in Vienna last night—a deal in which all the nations most closely affected by it, including Iran, pretty much start out knowing it won’t end well.”

Here, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that, as absolutely atrocious as the Clinton-Albright-Wendy Sherman deal with North Korea was, at least South Korea and Japan were involved and present for the talks, because our allies Japan and South Korea were the ones most affected by any deal that the United States cut with North Korea.

Now, it was an outrageous agreement. I mean, I was just a district judge at the time, but I knew, clearly, from history and from current events, that it was a deal that said, “Here, North Korea. We will help you build nuclear reactors, which will give you nuclear material to make sure you have got what you need. All we ask in return, basically, is that you promise that you will never use any of this stuff to create nuclear weapons.”

□ 2145

Of course, North Korea jumped on that deal—different from here, though. The number one most affected country by this deal is our dear friend Israel.

Well, this President and all his minions could not get Prime Minister Netanyahu defeated and out of office, as they tried to do. This administration has tried to punish Israel different ways, and those in the administration who really do want to punish Israel, that don’t like Israel, they have got to be smiling over this deal because it is absolutely unconscionable what has been done in the deal as it affects the future of Israel. It is just incredible that we could allow this.

Then Saudi Arabia, right there in the vicinity, they certainly understand

what a bad deal this is. As we understand it, they are already making clear they are going to have to have a nuclear weapon. Egypt is going to need a nuclear weapon.

This deal makes clear that Iran is going to have nuclear weapons in at least 10 years; 10 years, 2 months, whatever anybody wants to say, or out of my concern, possibly much sooner than that legally under the deal, even if it were ratified by the Senate. This is of tremendous concern.

This is what the entire world, except for the most evil perpetrators in it, has worried most about, a point in world history where there is massive proliferation of nuclear weapons.

It won't do much good to return a Nobel Peace Prize after a President causes nuclear proliferation that leads ultimately to the loss of millions of lives and rampant destruction around the world and, certainly, in the Middle East.

We have got all these folks worried about climate change, and here we are, on the brink of 10 years, at the most, before the most terroristic evil nation—well, the nation is not evil, their leaders are—the most evil leaders in the world have their hands on nuclear weapons that will kill millions of people.

It won't do much good for all those who lose their lives in a horrible flash if the President sends back his Nobel Peace Prize as being the cause of that.

That is why it is so important that we stop this deal. I don't have any belief at all that anybody in this administration wants the world to go up, after nuclear proliferation, in one big mushroom cloud.

I don't believe that; I know that is not true, but that is what their actions—if not stopped by Senators and House Members, that is what is going to happen.

This is not just me saying so. Dr. Carafano says: "The whole neighborhood will race to go nuclear. The number one concern with the way this deal was structured was that it was bound to accelerate nuclear proliferation. Iran has violated its obligations under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and repeatedly thumbed its nose at oversight from the International Atomic Energy Agency, the IAEA. Yet it winds up getting a great deal under the agreement—better, in fact, than the deal the United States gives its friends and allies, through the 123 civil nuclear agreements. If regional powers like Turkey, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia believe that the likelihood of Iran getting a weapon is undiminished and the penalty for becoming a nuclear breakout power is plummeting, then the deterrent for them to cross the nuclear threshold drops as well.

"Tehran gets to keep its vast nuclear infrastructure and its missile program."

It goes on to talk about that.

"Sanctions relief will make the region far less safe."

"The deal is temporary, by design."

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, we hear from our friends in the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, our local chambers of commerce, at least, about how normally to calculate economic impact of \$1 being spent somewhere, you have to multiply it times seven because that dollar gets spent again and spent again and spent again.

I would submit that, with this deal with Iran, the most evil leaders in the world, the \$100 billion to \$150 billion that this administration makes sure they have can't just be limited by \$100 billion to \$150 billion when it comes to the calculation of evil that will result from that money.

We can be sure that, since Iran sponsors terrorism around the world, that it will spend a lot of that money creating terrorism with other terrorists and with other evil people; and those evil people will then be able to take the billions of dollars they get from Iran and spend that for their evil purposes with other evil people.

You may be looking at, really, a trillion dollars by the time all of that money gets spent when you look at it as chambers of commerce normally do. The potential for evil, for the \$100 billion to \$150 billion going to an unrepentant sponsor of world terrorism, is really dramatic.

It is just incredible that this is happening on anybody's watch; Republican, Democrat, it doesn't matter. It is incredible.

Here is an article by Sarah Wheaton, July 21st: "In both a muscular speech to the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Pittsburgh and a taping of 'The Daily Show with Jon Stewart,' Obama cast critics of his diplomacy as the same kind of misguided warmongers who pushed for the invasion of Iraq during George W. Bush's Presidency."

I guess that includes Hillary Clinton; John Kerry, I think he may have been on board with that.

The article says: "'We're hearing the echoes of some of those same policies and mindset that failed us in the past,' Obama said in Pittsburgh. His loudest critics, he added, are 'the same folks who were so quick to go to war in Iraq and said it would take a few months.'"

Well, it is interesting to me that our President reserves making his case for the Iran deal for a venue such as Comedy Central, and it really would be a comedic escapade if this weren't so serious and we weren't talking about the existence of Israel, the continued lives or stoppage of lives of Christians and Jews around the world.

We know what the leaders of Iran think. They never, ever stop saying what they think. It is just incredible. They have never stopped demanding "death to America" and "death to Israel."

I see this article by Raf Sanchez from July 21st: "The U.S. said on Tuesday it was disturbed by an outburst of anti-American rhetoric from Iran's Supreme Leader in the wake of the nuclear deal,

as fierce debates over the agreement began in both the Iranian Parliament and U.S. Congress.

"John Kerry, the U.S. Secretary of State, said he was troubled by a fiery speech in which Ayatollah Khamenei promised to continue fomenting unrest across the Middle East and said Iran's 'policy towards the arrogant U.S. will not change.'

"If it is the policy, it's very disturbing, it's very troubling, and we'll have to wait and see."

No, we shouldn't have to wait and see. When Iran's evil leaders say they are going to keep fomenting trouble, they are going to keep killing Christians and Jews across the Middle East, they are going to keep killing moderate Muslims in the Middle East, we should not wait; we should take them seriously. They are saying it while the deal is still not affirmed and ratified here in the United States.

You would have to be a blooming idiot to make a deal with people who are saying they are going to take the money they get from this deal and kill Americans, kill Christians, kill Jews, and give them the money anyway. There are going to be consequences for this kind of irresponsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I would just encourage anyone who has access to an updated copy of the Iran deal, look to see for sure if it is limited to a 10-year deal or perhaps could somebody do an inspection and say, Oh, it is all good—maybe it is a 5-year deal instead of a 10-year deal.

When the person making the agreement has no power after the deal is signed, sealed, and delivered over when that deal ends, it is not a deal that should be made. That alone ought to be enough to make anyone walk away from it.

Mr. Speaker, I am immensely concerned for our friends around the world. I have mentioned numerous times—and I keep going back to the words of a west African named Ebenezer, a senior citizen there in west Africa who explained how excited they were when we elected our first Black President, but they have seen America get weaker, and he begged me to tell people in Washington that, when we get weaker in America, they suffer more around the world and specifically in Africa. Those words still bother me.

This deal with an evil group of leaders in Iran is going to spell death down the road for masses of people if we don't get it stopped.

Mr. Speaker, that is my plea. Let's stop the deal for the good of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a family emergency.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today until 3 p.m.